The University of Chicago

THE GENESIS OF THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF PAUL

A PART OF THE DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND
EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

By
MARY EDITH ANDREWS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1931

The University of Chicago

THE GENESIS OF THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF PAUL

A PART OF THE DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND
EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

By
MARY EDITH ANDREWS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1931

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

THE GENESIS OF THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF PAUL

Not until the end of the nineteenth century did any writer on Paul devote even a chapter to his ethical teaching. Many books on Paul have been written; he has been regarded as a theologian; his ideas have been expounded ad infinitum; the problems which he faced have been largely ignored. Professor Deissmann has attempted to show that Paul was a great religious genius rather than a theologian, but protesting voices have been few.[1] The twentieth century writers, when they treat his ethics, plainly reveal a tendency to derive his morality from his doctrines. Because they deal in ideas, there are almost as many conclusions on any given point as there are authors. Some see the Pauline ethics as "interim-ethics",[2] while others repudiate that idea.[3] Paul is a great creative genius in the realm of ethics;[4] he is original only in his doctrine of justification by faith.[5]

---

1. Adolf Deissmann, Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History (2nd English ed. London, 1926), pp.167-178.
2. Johannes Weiss, Das Urchristentum (Göttingen, 1917), p. 464; Albert Schweitzer, Die Mystik des Apostel Paulus (Tübingen, 1930), p. 378.
3. William Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul (Edinburgh, 1917), p. 193.
4. Heinrich Weinel, St. Paul (English ed. London, 1904), p. 329; Percy Gardner, The Religious Experience of St. Paul (London, 1911), p. 140.
5. Hans Windisch, "Das Problem des Paulinischen Imperatives", Zeitschrift für das Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft XXIII (1924), 281.

Equally eminent scholars see in this doctrine a fighting point only and Paul's major emphasis.[1] Pauline mysticism roots in his Hellenism,[2] in his eschatology,[3] in his communion with God,[4] according to the way his interpreters use data.

The extant studies on Paul are particularly inadequate on the point of Paul's motivation of ethics. This is due, in part at least, to the appeal to ideas. The genesis of Paul's ethical teaching, according to the first English investigator of the subject, is illuminated by three doctrines: his idea of flesh, his idea of Christ and his idea of salvation.[5] Another author derives Pauline morality from his doctrine of salvation by faith,[6] another asserts that his ethical precepts "flow directly as a natural sequence, from his dogmatic principles."[7] The emphasis is similar when a recent French writer practically makes Paul a Stoic because metaphysics and ethics belong together. The fact that Paul was interested in ethical conduct presupposes for this writer an interest in metaphysics, and the logical source for that in the first

---

1. Weiss, op. cit., p. 430; Windisch, op. cit., p. 265. Rudolf Bultmann, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus", Zeitschrift für das Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft XXIII (1924), 123-140. Bultmann makes justification the central emphasis in Paul.
2. Windisch, op. cit., p. 267.
3. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 37-41.
4. Gardner, op. cit., p. 155.
5. Orello Cone, Paul, the Man, Missionary and Teacher (London, 1898), pp. 375-377.
6. Gardner, op. cit., p. 159.
7. A.B.D. Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul (Glasgow, 1910), Preface p.vi.

century was Stoicism. Therefore, Paul must exhibit important affinities with Stoicism.[1]

There are two difficulties in the study of the motivation of Paul's ethical teaching. One is expressed in this quotation from a recent book, " Though he expected the end of the world on the morrow, he taught as if it would last forever."[2] The author of that sentence, however, does not raise the question why Paul, with such a conviction central in his life, feels that an ethical code is necessary, particularly since salvation is not to be achieved by works. The second difficulty is concerned with another major emphasis of Paul, his mysticism. Paul repeatedly insists that ethical action roots in the Spirit, which is clearly a supernatural grounding of ethics. Most writers recognize this emphasis on Spirit, but they vary in the way they describe the phenomenon.

An increasing number of writers see Paul a sacramentarian. This fact complicates the problem of motivation for it is not easy to see why with a supernaturally mediated salvation guaranteed, there should be an insistence upon the person behaving in moral fashion. Yet nothing is clearer than that Paul insists upon this very thing.

A survey both of Paul's own writings and of the extant literature about him and his writings makes one thing very clear. The question of the genesis of the ethical teaching

---

1. Paul Chappuis, La Destinee de L'Homme (Paris, 1926),p. 52.
2. M.S. Enslin, The Ethics of Paul (New York, 1930), p. 308.

of Paul cannot be traced to a single source. Too many factors are present in bold relief to make any such simple solution possible. More than a decade ago Johannes Weiss recognized this fact and attempted to state the problem in its broader outlines. He saw Paul's ethical outlook as developed under the influence of the Christian tradition, his conversion, the enthusiasm of his mysticism, and the demands of the common life. He made the definite attempt to integrate Paul's ethical teaching into its natural setting. Judaism and Hellenism both enter the process. Weiss was conscious of a Greek tinge in the Pauline ethical teaching, which has been recognized by some scholars, minimized by others, and denied by still others.[1] The one recent study, that of Professor Enslin, which attempts to give due prominence to the environment of Paul, with all its erudition, arrives at the conclusion that Paul's heritage from Judaism is all that is in any way influential in determining Paul's ethical outlook. His conclusion is materially weakened by his neglect of that very diverse phenomenon which we know as Diaspora Judaism, which was the Judaism of Paul, and by his acceptance of second-century sources, mediated through the

---

1. Weiss, op. cit., pp.424-464. The following authors recognize Greek influence in Pauline ethics: Weiss, op. cit., P. Wendland, Die Hellenistische-Römische Kultur (Tübingen, 1912); R. Bultmann, Der Stil des Paulinischen Predigt (Göttingen, 1910); K. Weidinger, Die Haustafeln (Leipzig, 1928). Greek influence is minimized by Enslin, op. cit., and by A. Bonhöffer, Epiktet und das Neue Testament (Giessen, 1911), and is practically denied by Schweitzer, op. cit., and by W. Weber, Christus-Mystik (Leipzig, 1924).

volumes of Professor Moore, as the foundation and basis of Paul's Judaism.

The present study assumes the legitimacy of investigating the ethics of Paul from the point of view of his social experience. Paul had much to say about human conduct; he is an important factor in the social experience of the Christian groups which he founded in some of the main urban centers of the Graeco-Roman world. We have primary source-material at our disposal, letters written to at least four Christian communities in which he had worked, and two letters to communities which he knew only through others. This makes possible the reconstruction of certain social situations that Paul faced as a missionary of the new faith. The surprising thing is that no one has yet studied the genesis of the ethical teaching of Paul from this more vital human approach.

The method is a simple one. It is the analysis of life-situations of Christian groups, as Paul's letters reveal them and as we are able, through the results of competent research, to understand the environment of early Christianity. The intensely practical nature of the problems is apparent. We may cite the more important ones. Must Gentiles become Jews to become Christians? Must Christians observe the Law of Moses as revealed in the Jewish Scriptures? In their new adjustments to life as Christians certain important problems arise. What is to be the relation of slave and master? How are Christians to think and act on problems of morality or immorality, how are they to regard the adulterer, etc? The

whole problem of marriage comes to the fore. The Christian community operates under pagan laws of marriage and divorce. What is to be done about the pagan couple one of whom becomes a Christian? What is to be the attitude toward marriage and divorce? Other complications arise. May Christians participate in pagan social and religious life? The tolerance of pagan cults toward each other complicated this matter. What place shall women have in the cult meetings? Shall they be veiled or not veiled, and why? What shall constitute proper procedure in the regular cult meetings, and in the observance of the Eucharist? Or in what spirit are Christian groups to face ill-treatment, either from pagan or Jewish neighbors?

Certainly the question of practice is uppermost. There is little that is theoretical, except as Paul argues to defend his practice. An illuminating illustration here is that of the circumcision controversy. The practice of non-circumcision of Gentiles precipitated the conflict, and writers have spilled gallons of ink in elucidating Paul's doctrine of justification by faith instead of understanding the social situation that underlay the rationalization.

In the analysis of the Pauline letters for the vital situations embodied in them another fact of interest methodologically, though at present not widely recognized, is apparent. In all the letters except those to the Christians at Corinth the fact of ethical precepts at the end of each letter is patent. These paranetic sections are usually treated in the same way as the non-paranetic ones for

exegetical purposes. In one sense this is legitimate procedure because Paul's seal of approval is there. In another sense they should be used with caution. They are so general in content even to the point of approaching the stereotyped that they may not be trusted for data on a given situation. To the student of the genesis of Pauline ethical teaching this distinction is important, for it at once lays open the question of the use of traditional material in Paul's letters, which of course has direct bearing on the question of the genesis of Paul's ethical teaching.

A small group of German scholars have done notable work in this field. The excellent volumes in the Handbuch zum Neuen Testament series, edited by Hans Lietzmann and containing his own contributions and those of Martin Dibelius are good examples. The recent monograph, Die Haustafeln, by Karl Weidinger is another example. Weidinger, by tracing the haustafel pattern from New Testament writings - the one Pauline example is Colossians 3:18ff. - through Jewish-Hellenistic literature, the literature of Stoicism and other Hellenistic literature, has pointed clearly to the probability of current pagan ethical teaching Christianized in Paul's paranetic sections. It is in these sections and in other occasional chapters such as Romans 1-2 that the relationship to other moralistic writings is so clear. Seneca's dictum, " The best ideas are common property" seems to hold here. Certainly Paul is indebted to the Stoics in the area of technique and method as the researches of Bultmann and others have clearly

shown. Paul used the same technique as the Stoic street-preachers of his day. Except in this practical area of the non-intellectualistic phases of first-century Stoicism Paul has no contact. The major Stoic emphases are utterly lacking in the Pauline letters, and what he makes central in the exposition of his faith is quite outside the pale of Stoic intellectualism.

The use of traditional material in Paul's letters is attested by the inductive approach to those letters. Paul acknowledges himself indebted to Christian tradition and to Christian practice (I Cor. 15:1-11; I Cor. 11:16). On at least one occasion he was grateful for the approval of the pillar apostles in Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1ff.). There is also an ever-present Jewish element in his letters mainly finding expression in his idea of God, the Pharisaic doctrine of the Resurrection, and the appeal to Scripture. It should be noted that this is in the area of intellectual content, not in the area of practice, or of the majority of his expressed attitudes on Jews and Judaism.

An inductive study of Paul's letters shows that the Jewish basis of Pauline ethics has been vastly overestimated. No one would care to minimize the contribution of Paul's ancestral faith to the shaping of his attitudes on and reactions to matters of conduct. It is one thing to see the ethical impulse characteristic of Judaism reproduced in Paul; it is another to see him practically uninfluenced by the impact of pagan morality as it was current in Tarsus; it is still

another to ignore present experience and appeal solely to any past heritage. We may freely admit that Judaism was very influential in Paul's life and still find something other than Judaism taking the place of pre-eminence in any given social situation where Paul felt constrained to give an ethical judgment.

A careful study of the letters of Paul reveals the predominance of certain important non-Jewish elements. It is much more than policy and expediency that makes Paul insist that circumcision and Law observance are unnecessary for Gentile Christians. He had discovered in his own personal experience and in his missionary activity that there is another approach to the religious life than by way of the works of the Law. To the Jew the Law was essential, it was the revealed will of God, man's salvation depended upon his obedience to it. But Paul was aware of something more important quite apart from the Law. In countless Christian meetings he had experienced this new surge of feeling that swept through the group, this strange power that produced such tangible results.

The psychology of Paul was not the psychology of the normal man. As a fanatical young Jew, devoted to the Jewish tradition, he had been willing to persecute the people of the new sect, even to the point of going to far-away Damascus, where there was such a group. Willingness to persecute, to be cruel, reveals a streak in the nature of Paul that belongs in the realm of the abnormal. The psychologists call it

sadism. Its opposite, masochism or willingness to inflict torture on himself, is also present in Paul. At this other extreme he borders on the abnormal in the glorying in hardship and in the joyful contemplation of probable martyrdom (I Cor. 9:26-27; II Cor. 11:22-33; Phil. 2:17-18). In the more ordinary contacts of life he reveals an emotional intensity and instability that makes it difficult for him to work with people whom he cannot dominate (II Cor. 1-7). He is an example of the temperament that is constitutionally unable to see its own mistakes. He is always gloriously right, whether it is as a fanatical Jew ready to persecute those who see another way or whether it is as a fanatical Christian amazed that the Jews turn away from the true Jewish message, which but for their blindness they would see.

These qualities of temperament unfitted Paul for the normal religious experience within Judaism. Judaism was a religion for the group. Paul is often intensely individualistic. The average normal Jew did not grow morbid over his inability to achieve the standard of Torah; he did not see himself the doomed victim of conflicting principles from which he had to be rescued by external means (Romans 7: 13-25). He would not see the Law as the revealer of sin (Romans 3:22), rather it was the God-given command through which his salvation was assured. It did not plunge him into the depths of despair, rather the sense of security which it gave to him kept him cheerful and optimistic about the outcome of life. Paul could not find his religious satisfactions by

way of the Law, but finding them by another way and being an individualist and an extremely self-assured person, he leaped to the conclusion that his new way was the way by which all men must be saved.

Paul's depiction of his religion as he preached it is in line with the popular religions of redemption in contrast with those religions where man worked out his own salvation, as in Judaism and Stoicism. Paul chose the way of emotional appeal, which was the method of the mysteries. This method, by his own confession (Gal. 3:1 cf. I Cor. 2:2), was to picture Christ crucified and to move the emotions. In the tense, highly wrought state that followed, "miracles" were not surprising. It is a thoroughly spiritistic religion that we find in Paul. In every letter this Pauline mysticism shines through. This might much better be described by the term "spiritism" for the Greek vocabulary conveys a sense of the dynamic and the supernatural that can scarcely be rendered into English without losing its force. The researches of Professor Richard Reitzenstein have established the fact that Paul uses the language of the mysteries in this area of his experience. A few of the outstanding citations are given and others indicated, when too long to quote.

> " I have been crucified with Christ, it is no longer I that live, but Christ that lives in me." (Gal.2:20)
>
> " ...if you let yourselves be circumcised Christ can do nothing for you" (Gal. 5:2). " For in union with Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor the want of it counts for anything, but only faith acting through love" (Gal. 5:6).

> " So if anyone is in union with Christ he is a new being, the old state of things has passed away, there is a new state of things" (II Cor. 5:17).
>
> " For his sake I have lost everything and think it rubbish in order to gain Christ and be known to be united with him with any righteousness I may have not based on law but coming through faith in Christ- the righteousness that comes from God through faith. I want to know him in the power of resurrection, and to share his sufferings and even his death, in the hope of attaining resurrection from the dead" (Phil. 3:9-11).
>
> " So there is no condemnation any more for those who are in union with Christ Jesus....For you are not physical, but spiritual, if God's spirit has really taken possession of you; for unless a man has Christ's spirit he does not belong to Christ" (Rom. 8:1,9).

All this is very individualistic. I Corinthians 12-14 show Paul attempting to curb the unrestrained individualism of this religious outlook. Clearly, attachment to the Lord of the cult was basic in Paul's religion. This is Hellenistic, not Jewish.

Other evidences of spiritism in Paul's religion are very clear. Paul thought of the world as under the domination of evil powers (Col. 2:15; Rom. 8:38). The Christians' safety was assured only because of the superior strength of the good supernatural power. The danger in participating in pagan cult-meals was that a demon might be taken into the body, and Christ would not share the same abode as a demon (I Cor. 10:20-22). Wrong participation in the Eucharist resulted in illness and death (I Cor. 11:30). Paul conceived of the Christian's connection with Christ very realistically. The man who was "in Christ" was a part of the body of Christ. By virtue of the pneuma in him the Christian

became something which he had not been before. His nature was changed.

Religion and ethics are inseparable in Paul. The same is true of Judaism, in which the Law was designed to produce a people fit for God's judgment by virtue of their obedience to his commands. Paul's repudiation of the Law forced him to a different motivation of conduct. He takes the only theoretical step he can take. If man is helpless, unable to work out his own salvation, yet, if by the free gift of God appropriated through faith he secures acquittal in God's judgment, it follows that ethical results, while present, have a different source. They are no longer naturally acquired but now have a supernatural sanction. It is the Spirit that produces love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. With the Stoics man achieved these qualities of character in his own strength; not so with Paul, who clearly bases his ethics upon the possession of the indwelling Spirit. Paul sets flesh and spirit in sharp contrast. The common vices belong to the natural man. They can be overcome only by the possession within the person of the supernatural essence, the Spirit, by man's becoming what he was not, a "new creation in Christ Jesus". Naturally judged by such a norm, man's conduct becomes an index of his possession or non-possession of the Spirit (Gal. 5:16-26).

When Paul develops his argument against immorality in I Corinthians 5:12-20, he bases it on his underlying spiritism.

It may be his Jewish heritage that conditions his emotional reaction to the sins of sex, but his argument is based upon his mysticism. By virtue of the indwelling pneuma the Christian is joined realistically to the body of the Lord of the cult. When a Christian has sex-relations with a prostitute, he is therefore bringing the body of Christ into this unholy connection. It is the Lord who is wronged, drawn into an immoral relationship, because of the pneuma of the Christian.

Again Paul bases his argument for non-interference in the mixed marriages in Corinth (I Cor. 7:12ff.) on the foundation of spiritism. The Christian partner has the pneuma, that divine addition that makes him a " new creation in Christ Jesus". Just as the heinousness of prostitution was due to bringing the body of the Lord into connection with that of a prostitute, so it is possible to counteract the presence of the demon in one partner by the more powerful pneuma of the other.

Paul's most clinching argument against participation in pagan feasts is the spiritistic one. The idol, it is true, has no real existence, but the demon behind the idol is a reality (I Cor. 10:19-20). If the Christian takes a demon into him, it will drive out the pneuma of Christ, which was his normal possession as a Christian. And in Paul's discussion of the Christian Eucharist the fact of his spiritistic belief is clear when he attributes sickness and death in the community to wrong participation in the cult-meal.

Paul sets Law and Spirit in sharp antithesis in Romans 7:5-6.

> " For when we were living mere physical lives the sinful passions, awakened by the Law, operated through the organs of our bodies to make us bear fruit for death. But now the Law no longer applies to us; we have died to what once controlled us, so that we can now serve in the new Spirit, not under the old letter." Cf. Romans 8:1, 9.

The foregoing examples were all taken from letters where Paul expounds his religious positions most vigorously, as in the conflict-situations of Galatians and Corinthians, and the careful exposition of his spiritistic emphases in Romans 6-8. It seems certain that Paul regards the possession of the pneuma as necessary to human ethical achievement. Man is unable to achieve his own salvation ethically. His nature must be re-enforced by that divine increment of spirit, that dynamic power working in human beings to produce "signs, wonders, marvels", which alone conditions human achievement.

Paul's motivation of human conduct, however, cannot be reduced to any such single source. The problem is more complicated. His concern with ethics is constant, in spite of his belief that the end of the world is imminent, and in spite of his rejection of the Law which stressed works. At times his ethical outlook is distinctly colored by his eschatology. Why should Paul attempt to set up ethical standards in a world doomed to pass away soon? The answer is usually found in the fact that he was nurtured in Judaism which emphasized rewards. More illogical is his insistence on the

necessity of ethical conduct when his religious outlook is so clearly sacramental. With efficacious sacraments there should be no necessity for working out one's own salvation. Paul operates with three different sets of imagery, the eschatological, the sacramental and the ethical. There is every evidence that he never thought through the logical inconsistencies of his thought. At times all three sets of imagery blend as in Philippians 1:9-10. In Phil. 2:1ff. there is both the ethical and the sacramental outlook, and in Phil. 2:15-16 the ethical and the eschatological are in close conjunction.

The survey of Paul's letters where the social situations which he met are analyzed should provide the surest norms for his motivation of conduct. This survey has revealed a Paul who truly is " all things to all men", although upon occasion he describes his own conduct and sets up himself and Christ as norms of ethical conduct. He frequently anticipates the Parousia. He was tremendously concerned to have everything with himself and his churches just right on that great day. In close conjunction here is his occasional appeal to the Judgment and to the idea of reward and punishment.

He occasionally makes a social appeal. He likens the immoral man of I Cor. 5:1 ff. to leaven which will permeate the whole lump, therefore, he must be purged out of the Christian community. Paul also appeals to the motive of brother-love and consideration for the "weak" when the Christian is tempted to think only of his own liberty and rights (I Cor. 8:9-13). As we have indicated there was also

the spiritistic motivation in the case of immorality. Paul is socially conservative. The status quo is to be preserved. The Christians are to obey the government. The slave "in Christ" should not seek release. Perhaps there is eschatological conditioning here, perhaps only the desire to avoid trouble. He appeals to spiritism in connection with the observance of the Eucharist in the same discussion of the Lord's Supper in which he has appealed to the tradition as it was handed down in the church (I Cor. 11:23-34).

There are two points at which Paul is most clearly Jewish in outlook, viz., in his decision on the participation of women in the Christian meetings in Corinth and in his advice about obedience to the state in Romans 13. In the first instance prejudice overrules Paul's major religious emphasis on the status of the individual " in Christ" regardless of sex. Here the immediate circumstances rule. Paul had difficult women to deal with in Corinth. His attitude to the state is typical of Diaspora Judaism.

On the question of marriage Paul has a different standard for every type of situation. In general he favors the ascetic ideal. Where continence is a possibility marriage is not desirable. In this connection it should be noted that Paul admits that his attitudes are determined by the fact of the near end of the world. Asceticism is the ideal for virgins, if possible. Marriage is no sin, although it is a worldly care. Here is religious motivation, but not spiritistic. In the case of those already married Paul is non-

ascetic, and counsels against continence. Again the judgment is conditioned by the practical necessities of the situation. Any continence allowed is for religious ends. Here the appeal is to religious practice older than Paul and not limited to the Christian cult.

There is to be no divorce among Christians. A second marriage is allowed but not encouraged, and in the event of such marriage both partners must be Christians. In the case of mixed marriages Paul would not disrupt the union where the couple desire to continue living together. But if they do not so desire, let the unbeliever depart, since marriage certainly is not slavery. Clearly here is a norm determined purely by circumstances. Paul rationalizes his judgment by appeal to spiritism as pointed out above.

On the matter of circumcision and Law observance practice takes precedence over theory. The rationalization is to substitute "walking by the Spirit" for the other method of "walking by the Law". There is an experiential appeal here. Paul found the emotional approach to religion a satisfying one to himself individually, therefore he saw it as equally satisfying for all men.

An inductive approach to the study of the ethical teaching of Paul points to the fact that this teaching was the product of his social experience. This comes out clearly in the non-paranetic sections of the letters where we find Paul in a vital social situation. Many of the problems which he faced could not be settled by any appeal to the

past. He had to be content with compromise at times, as in the question of marriage in Corinth. He had to take people as he found them and appeal to whatever incentives to more worthy living that he could find. The great variety of standards shows that Paul simply did the best he could in the immediate situation, and when conflict arose, he attempted to justify his course of action or his judgment. His arguments do not always appeal to the modern mind as rational in spite of past efforts to see in Paul the profound intellectual leader of early Christianity.

As his immediate judgments on ethical matters were conditioned by the necessity of circumstances, so also the presence of hortatory sections in his letters was motivated by the needs of his communities. As we have seen, it is possible to detect the use of traditional material and the dependence on Stoic and Hellenistic-Jewish moral appeals. Originality in the formulation of ethical precepts is the last thing we ought to expect of any religious or ethical teacher. Moral codes and moral teaching do not grow that way.

The weakness of the theological approach to the teaching of Paul is that it is often forced to the explanation of Paul's explanations. When he is approached by way of his ideas - often his rationalizations and defenses - the way is thrown open to pure subjectivity on the part of the writer. Paul has all too often been made to teach current theology and ethics. On the other hand the approach to his teaching by way of the human and social elements offers a fascinating study to

the student of early Christianity, and the inductive approach is less likely to be subjective. Neat generalizations and convenient pigeon-holing are rendered more difficult, but Paul is allowed to say what he actually said. When we are no longer constrained to see Paul the authoritative basis for our modern ideas, we can see him as he depicts himself, and the picture is much more vital. Many of the things which his appreciative and somewhat biassed biographers have said may still be said, and other things that writers have neglected to say should be said if the picture of Paul is to be a real one.

Without stressing any particular psychological approach which may soon be outmoded, so rapidly do psychological fashions change, much can be learned about Paul's life of struggle from a study of the man himself as he met difficult human problems. Many things become more clear when we frankly face the facts of Paul's temperament: His self-assurance, his emotional instability, his capacity for hardships that verges on the ascetic and the masochistic. It is along the lines of the psychological and the social approach that Paul awaits further investigation. The present study is a beginning in one area of Paul's interest.